



Patent

Attorney's Docket No. 1033630-000003

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of)	Mail Stop AF
)	
Maurice Israel et al.)	Group Art Unit: 1649
)	
Application No.: 10/049,296)	Examiner: GREGORY S EMCH
)	
Filed: August 6, 2002)	Confirmation No.: 9468
)	
For: PROCESS FOR IDENTIFYING)	
MODULATING COMPOUNDS OF)	
NEUROMEDIATORS)	
)	
)	

REPLY

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated September 15, 2005 Applicants offer the following remarks. This reply is timely filed with a petition for one month extension of time as a Notice of Appeal was filed on March 15, 2006.

Reconsideration of the subject application in light of the following remarks, pursuant to and consistent with 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.116 and 41.33(d)(1), are respectfully requested.

This Reply does not introduce any new issues, present any amended claims, or present any new claims. This Reply directly addresses the reasons alleged by the Examiner for maintaining the rejections that remain in the application. In particular, this Reply presents an analysis of the cited art and the differences between the cited art and the present invention in the form of a Declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132. The Declaration was not earlier presented, because Applicants believed and continue to believe that differences between the cited art and the present invention are sufficiently apparent upon careful consideration of the references themselves and that a Declaration should not be required. Applicant's belief